

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 14, 17-25, 27-30, 32, 34, and 35 are pending in the application. Claim 28 has been amended by the present amendment to depend from claim 27 (instead of claim 17) to correct an inadvertent error.

Claims 1, 12, 14, 25, 27, 32, 34, and 35 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,028,075 to Morris. Claims 5, 17, 18, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris in view of U.S. Patent 6,425,001 to Lo et al. ("Lo"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Morris is directed to a method and system for sharing digital images over a network. Referring to FIG. 1 of Morris, images 21 obtained from a user computer 12 are sent to and stored in a photomail server 20, and in response to a request from another computer 36, the stored images 21 are transmitted from the photomail server 20 to the computer 36 (see, e.g., column 4, lines 7-24 of Morris).

In particular, referring to column 4, lines 16-24, in Morris, when an email request is received, the photomail server 20 "strips and stores the images 21, and then sends a standard email message 31 to the recipient with a link 33 to the images 21, rather than the images 21 themselves." The recipient can click on the link 33 to display the images 21 from the photomail server 20 on the recipient's web browser (see column 4, lines 21-24).

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1 (and the other independent claims) over Morris, the Morris reference does not teach or suggest a method in which a summary document includes location information specifying a location where image information is stored and summary image information, the summary document being attached to an email transmitted to one or more terminal apparatus *as claimed*.

As described in column 5, lines 18-20 of Morris, the link 33 refers to a "URL to the 'album' in the email message 31." In Morris, the link 33 provides a link to a location of an "album" made up of the images 21. Therefore, the email message 31 sent to the recipient merely contains a link to the images 21, not any summary image information.

In other words, in Morris, a summary document (i.e., the email message 31, according to the Office Action of 10/31/2007) does not contain both location information and summary image information, as required by independent claim 1 (and the other independent claims).

Further, in Morris, there is no teaching or suggestion that summary image information is generated. In Morris, the photomail server 20 merely strips and stores the images 21 thus sent. Therefore, Morris does not teach or suggest generating summary image information, e.g., information obtained by compressing or reducing image information, information obtained by decreasing resolution, the number of colors, or information obtained by re-editing image information.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the Morris reference does not anticipate or otherwise render obvious the Applicant's claimed invention, whether taken alone or in combination with the Lo reference.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Date: January 31, 2008

Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874